



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,022	09/29/2005	David A. Fish	GB 030037	8258
24737	7590	12/15/2008	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			MCCOMMAS, STUART S	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2629	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
10/551,022	FISH, DAVID A.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Stuart McCommas	2629	

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

**THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.**

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
 See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Sumati Lefkowitz/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 12/9/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 8-10 of Applicant's remarks, the Applicant argues that because each of Young, Aoki, and Cok disclose only a single photosensor, and that combinations of those references do not suggest the present invention. The Applicant argues that the combination of the above references would not have been obvious to create the present invention.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees, because while the above cited references do not disclose two photosensitive elements, nonetheless the modification of Young with Cok and Aoki is an obvious combination and clearly provides the present invention. Young discloses one photosensitive element (figure 2), and Aoki discloses a further photosensitive element 17 which is shielded from light emitted by the display element 15 while being exposed to light from other directions (column 2 lines 37-60; figure 1), and it would have been obvious to modify Young with Aoki to produce a display for the purpose of providing automatic brightness control by detecting ambient light to improve the quality of a display even as a display element degrades, which purpose Aoki describes in column 1 lines 29-38. Young discloses one photosensitive element (figure 2), and Cok discloses a photo sensitive element 21 which in the absence of an energized emissive layer 50 is connected so as to compensate for and cancel photocurrents produced in the photo sensitive element 21 by ambient light (column 2 lines 50-67; column 3 lines 56-67; column 4 lines 1-30; figure 1; figure 2), and it would have been obvious to modify Young with Cok for the purpose of improving detection and control of light from a display element, which purpose Cok describes in column 2 lines 8-13. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known about the elements in Aoki and Cok, and it would have been obvious for the reasons stated to combine these elements with Young.